



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/571,503 | 03/10/2006 | Jean-Yves Bitterlich | 071308.1015 (2003P13403WO) | 4152 |
| 86528 | 7590 | 01/05/2010 | EXAMINER | |
| King & Spalding LLP 401 Congress Avenue Suite 3200 Austin, TX 78701 | | | PHANTANA ANGKOOOL, DAVID | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2175 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 01/05/2010 PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/571,503

Applicant(s)

BITTERLICH, JEAN-YVES

Examiner

David Phantana-angkool

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2009.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-12 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 13-18 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been reassigned to Examiner David Phantana-angkool.
2. This action is responsive to RCE filed on October 19th, 2009.
3. Claims 4-12 are pending in the case. Claims 4, 7, and 10 are independent claims.
4. Applicants amended claims 4, 7, and 10.
5. Applicants added claims 13-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
8. **Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Special Edition Using Microsoft Windows XP Home Edition", Publishing Date: October 10, 2001 (hereinafter Cowart) in view of Fernandes, US# 6,014,135.**
As for independent claim 4:

Art Unit: 2175

Cowart shows a method for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a processing computer, wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to couple a respective input and/or output device, comprising of:

- generating an assembled display combining at least a portion of a display belonging to the object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing computer (Remote Desktop, the local computer (Fig. 17.11) allows the user to specify the Display of the Remote Desktop Connection to a fixed window size or Full Screen (Table 17.2). This whole display of the local computer which shows the local computer content and the Remote Desktop display, in fixed window mode, which shows content of the Remote Computer is the assembled display,
- *activating at the object computer a local file processing function on the processing computer* (Remote Desktop, Figure 17.13, Pg.3 , Para. 1, shows the user may manipulate objects displayed on the remote computer's desktop at the local computer),
- *generating an object processing platform by moving an object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the processing computer* (Remote Desktop, Pg. 3, and Figure 17.13 shows a remote desktop. The remote desktop is displayed at a local computer. Once the user at the local computer successfully logged on to the remote computer via Remote Desktop, the user at the local computer may manipulate the objects that are displayed on a remote computer, see Paras. 1 and 2. The interaction area is the desktop area of the local computer which shows the content of the local computer and the fixed window of the remote desktop. It is noted that Figure 17.13 shows the remote desktop in Full Screen Mode. The user may specify at the local computer to have the remote desktop displayed in a fixed window or a full screen mode, see table 17.2).

While Cowart shows a method for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a processing computer, Cowart does not specifically show *wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the object from the object computer to the interaction area*. However in the same field of invention Fernandes shows a collaborative routing system which allows the user to route or share documents from one user to another user in column 12, lines 51-68. In column 11, lines 35-44,

Art Unit: 2175

Fernandes shows the user moving the object to route the stored document to another user. Accordingly it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention was as made to modify the method of Cowart to incorporate the collaborative routing system as taught by Fernandes, thus allowing two computers, a local computer and a remote computer, to easily share a stored document.

As for dependent claim 5:

Cowart-Fernandes suggests *the method according to claim 4, further, comprising an application-specific processing of the object is started by a further coupling of the object to an application icon on the display belonging to the processing computer* (Fernandes, 10:30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Cowart for the same reason stated previously above (see claim 4 *supra*)

As for dependent claim 6:

Cowart-Fernandes suggests *the method according to claim 5, wherein object-computer-specific data of the object is converted into application-specific data* (Fernandes, 10:40-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Cowart for the same reason stated previously above (see claim 4 *supra*)

As for independent claim 7:

Claim 7 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for independent claim 10:

Claim 10 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 11 and 12:

Claims 11 and 12 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 13-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2175

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DP
/David Phantana-angkool/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/William L. Bashore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175